

Multi-photon decays of the Higgs boson in standard model: leading terms from Heisenberg-Euler effective Lagrangian

Yi Liao¹

School of Physics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China

Abstract

We calculate the multi-photon decay widths of the Higgs boson from an effective Lagrangian for a system of electromagnetic and Higgs fields. We utilize a low-energy theorem to connect the above Lagrangian to the Heisenberg-Euler effective Lagrangian induced by charged particles that gain mass from interactions with the Higgs boson. In the standard model only the $W^\pm$ gauge bosons and the top quark are relevant, and we compute their contributions to the effective couplings and the multi-photon decay widths of the Higgs boson.

PACS: 14.80.Bn, 12.20.-m, 12.15.Lk

¹liaoy@nankai.edu.cn

A new boson has recently been discovered at the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [1, 2], whose properties are found to be close to those expected for the Higgs boson, h , in the standard model (SM) [3, 4, 5]. The rare two-photon decay of the Higgs boson has offered a golden detection channel in this great endeavor; for a review on Higgs phenomenology see for instance [6]. As more events are being accumulated, its detailed properties will be uncovered. More optimistically, a linear collider or even a dedicated Higgs factory will be very helpful to reveal whether the particle is genuinely the last missing piece of SM or the first new member in a bigger picture. For this purpose, it is necessary to examine exhaustively its production and decay properties. In this work we study its multi-photon decays which are closely related to the two-photon channel.

As a neutral particle, the photonic decay of the Higgs boson is a purely quantum effect. In SM the decay arises at the one-loop level through interactions with the vacuum charged particles which gain mass through the Higgs mechanism [7, 8, 9]. This last feature implies that the heaviest charged particles, the top quark and the $W^\pm$ gauge bosons, dominate the decay process. The two-photon decay rate in SM was computed long time ago [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. As the number of photons increases, the computation rapidly becomes technically more and more challenging. This arises due mainly to the constraint from electromagnetic gauge invariance, which results in significant cancellation amongst the contributions from individual Feynman graphs [15]. Fortunately, it has also been known for long [10, 12] that the two-photon decay amplitude can be reasonably well approximated by the leading terms in the expansion of the Higgs mass m_h over twice masses of the relevant heavy charged particles, i.e., $2m_{t,W}$; for instance, for $m_h = 125$ GeV as indicated by the measurements at LHC, the leading terms account for about 65% of the exact one-loop decay width. With more photons in the final state sharing the Higgs boson mass and thus becoming softer on average, we expect that the expansion in $r_{t,W} = [m_h/(2m_{t,W})]^2$ works even better. In this work we report the results for the four- and six-photon decay rates in this approximation.

The low-energy effective Lagrangian for the system of the Higgs boson and electromagnetic fields starts with the terms that involve the least number of derivatives for a given number of fields while respecting electromagnetic gauge invariance. Since the Higgs field h is neutral, the electromagnetic field must form into gauge invariants in itself. There are two such basic invariants involving the least number of derivatives, $\mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}F_{\mu\nu}F_{\alpha\beta}$, which are respectively a Lorentz scalar and pseudoscalar. Attaching derivatives to h , $\mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{G}$ does not harm the gauge symmetry but will yield terms of a higher order in the low-energy expansion. We assume that charge conjugation (C) and parity (P) are good symmetries, which is the case in SM at the level under consideration. Then, the Higgs boson as a C- and P-even particle can only decay into an even number of photons, and the pseudoscalar invariant $\mathcal{G}$ must appear as an even power in interactions with the Higgs boson. The leading terms in the single- h sector can therefore be parameterized as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_h = & \xi_{10}h\mathcal{F} + h\left[\frac{1}{2!}\xi_{20}\mathcal{F}^2 + \frac{1}{2!}\xi_{02}\mathcal{G}^2\right] + h\left[\frac{1}{3!}\xi_{30}\mathcal{F}^3 + \frac{1}{2!}\xi_{12}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G}^2\right] \\ & + h\left[\frac{1}{4!}\xi_{40}\mathcal{F}^4 + \frac{1}{2!2!}\xi_{22}\mathcal{F}^2\mathcal{G}^2 + \frac{1}{4!}\xi_{04}\mathcal{G}^4\right] + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

The effective coupling ξ_{ij} accompanies the form $\mathcal{F}^i \mathcal{G}^j$, and is proportional to $e^{2(i+j)} y_h M^{3-4(i+j)}$, where e is the electromagnetic coupling, y_h is the Higgs coupling to the relevant heavy charged fields (top quark and $W^\pm$ bosons in SM) of mass M , and a sum over them is implied.

To present the decay amplitudes in a compact form, we introduce the notations for a pair of photons, ij , with outgoing momenta k_i, k_j and polarization vectors $\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j$,

$$E_{ij} = k_i \cdot \varepsilon_j^* k_j \cdot \varepsilon_i^* - k_i \cdot k_j \varepsilon_i^* \cdot \varepsilon_j^*, \quad (2)$$

$$O_{ij} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} k_i^\mu k_j^\nu \varepsilon_i^{*\alpha} \varepsilon_j^{*\beta} \quad (3)$$

A factor of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G})$ in $\mathcal{L}_h$ when assigned to the photon pair ij will yield in the amplitude a factor of E_{ij} (O_{ij}). Note that both notations are symmetric under the interchange of the two photons. The amplitude for the two-photon decay $h \rightarrow 12$ is

$$\mathcal{A}_{12} = \xi_{10} E_{12} \quad (4)$$

The results for the decay into more photon pairs are similar with the only difference being in combinatorics. For instance, for the four-photon decay $h \rightarrow 1234$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{1234} = \xi_{20} E_{1234} + \xi_{02} O_{1234}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$E_{1234} = E_{12} E_{34} + E_{13} E_{24} + E_{14} E_{23}, \quad (6)$$

$$O_{1234} = O_{12} O_{34} + O_{13} O_{24} + O_{14} O_{23}, \quad (7)$$

and for the six-photon decay $h \rightarrow 123456$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{12\dots 6} = \xi_{30} E_{12\dots 6} + \xi_{12} [E_{12} O_{3456} + 14 \text{ perms.}], \quad (8)$$

where

$$E_{12\dots 6} = E_{12} (E_{34} E_{56} + E_{35} E_{46} + E_{36} E_{45}) + 4 \text{ perms.} \quad (9)$$

The sum over photons' polarizations in the amplitudes squared is complicated, and has been done with the help of a computer code. We find for the two-photon decay,

$$\sum |\mathcal{A}_{12}|^2 = \xi_{10}^2 2U(12), \quad (10)$$

where

$$U(12) = (12)^2 \quad (11)$$

with $(ij) \equiv k_i \cdot k_j$. The pure- E and pure- O terms for the four-photon decay are found to contribute the same, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum |\mathcal{A}_{1234}|^2 &= [\xi_{20}^2 + \xi_{02}^2] [10U(1234) - 8X(1234)] \\ &\quad + 2\xi_{20}\xi_{02} [-6U(1234) + 8X(1234)], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where

$$U(1234) = \sum_{3 \text{ perms.}} (ij)^2(mn)^2 = (12)^2(34)^2 + 2 \text{ perms.}, \quad (13)$$

$$X(1234) = \sum_{3 \text{ perms.}} (ij)(jm)(mn)(ni) = (12)(23)(34)(41) + 2 \text{ perms.} \quad (14)$$

The result for the six-photon case is fairly lengthy:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum |\mathcal{A}_{1\dots 6}|^2 \\ = & \xi_{30}^2 [44U(1\dots 6) + 24V(1\dots 6) + 120Y(1\dots 6) - 56X(1\dots 6)] \\ & + \xi_{12}^2 [348U(1\dots 6) - 8V(1\dots 6) + 504Y(1\dots 6) - 216X(1\dots 6)] \\ & + 2\xi_{30}\xi_{12} [-36U(1\dots 6) - 104V(1\dots 6) - 360Y(1\dots 6) + 168X(1\dots 6)], \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the functions of six-photons' momenta are

$$U(1\dots 6) = \sum_{15 \text{ perms.}} (ij)^2(mn)^2(pq)^2, \quad (16)$$

$$V(1\dots 6) = \sum_{15 \text{ perms.}} U(ij)X(mnpq), \quad (17)$$

$$X(1\dots 6) = \sum_{60 \text{ perms.}} (ij)(jm)(mn)(np)(pq)(qi), \quad (18)$$

$$Y(1\dots 6) = \sum_{10 \text{ perms.}} (ij)(jp)(pi)(mn)(nq)(qm) \quad (19)$$

The phase-space integral for an all-massless final state can be completely finished for a polynomial of momenta. An elegant method was provided in [16]. Denoting the n -photon phase-space integral as

$$\text{PS}_n = \frac{1}{n!} \int \prod_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}_j}{(2\pi)^3 2|\mathbf{k}_j|} \right] (2\pi)^4 \delta^4 \left(p - \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \right), \quad (20)$$

where p is the incoming momentum of the Higgs boson, the basic idea is to decouple the correlation amongst the photons' momenta by converting the delta function back to an integral over the coordinate x and introducing a separate integral for each photon [16],

$$J(x) = \int \frac{d^3 k}{2|\mathbf{k}|} e^{-ik \cdot x} = -\frac{2\pi}{x^2}, \quad (21)$$

where an infinitesimal, negative imaginary part is attached to x_0 to make the integral well-defined. The factors of k are induced by derivatives with respect to x , for instance, for our study here, the following will be required,

$$J^{\alpha\beta}(x) = \int \frac{d^3 k}{2|\mathbf{k}|} k^\alpha k^\beta e^{-ik \cdot x} = i^2 \partial^\alpha \partial^\beta J(x), \quad (22)$$

and the scalar products of different photons' momenta in the phase-space integral are obtained by appropriate contractions with the signature tensor. The final central integral is the following one for $m \geq 2$ [16]:

$$I_m(p) = \int d^4x \frac{e^{ip \cdot x}}{(x^2)^m} = \frac{(-1)^m 2^{5-2m} \pi^3}{(m-1)!(m-2)!} (p^2)^{m-2} \quad (23)$$

We list the integrals that are required for the Higgs decays up to six photons:

$$[2\gamma]_1 = \text{PS}_2(12)^2 = \frac{(4\pi)^2}{2!(2\pi)^6} 12I_4(p), \quad (24)$$

$$[4\gamma]_1 = \text{PS}_4(12)^2(34)^2 = \frac{(4\pi)^4}{4!(2\pi)^{12}} 144I_8(p), \quad (25)$$

$$[4\gamma]_2 = \text{PS}_4(12)(23)(34)(41) = \frac{(4\pi)^4}{4!(2\pi)^{12}} 84I_8(p), \quad (26)$$

$$[6\gamma]_1 = \text{PS}_6(12)^2(34)^2(56)^2 = \frac{(4\pi)^6}{6!(2\pi)^{18}} 1728I_{12}(p), \quad (27)$$

$$[6\gamma]_2 = \text{PS}_6(12)(23)(34)(45)(56)(61) = \frac{(4\pi)^6}{6!(2\pi)^{18}} 732I_{12}(p), \quad (28)$$

$$[6\gamma]_3 = \text{PS}_6(12)^2(34)(45)(56)(63) = \frac{(4\pi)^6}{6!(2\pi)^{18}} 1008I_{12}(p), \quad (29)$$

$$[6\gamma]_4 = \text{PS}_6(12)(23)(31)(45)(56)(64) = \frac{(4\pi)^6}{6!(2\pi)^{18}} 576I_{12}(p) \quad (30)$$

Noting that the terms obtained by permutation of the photons' momenta contribute the same in the phase-space integrals, the decay widths are worked out to be

$$\Gamma(2\gamma) = \frac{m_h^3}{2^6 \pi} \xi_{10}^2, \quad (31)$$

$$\Gamma(4\gamma) = \frac{m_h^{11}}{2^{20} 3^3 5^2 7 \pi^5} [2(\xi_{20}^2 + \xi_{02}^2) - \xi_{20} \xi_{02}], \quad (32)$$

$$\Gamma(6\gamma) = \frac{m_h^{19}}{2^{36} 3^8 5^3 7^2 11 \pi^9} [2\xi_{30}^2 + 9\xi_{12}^2 - 3\xi_{30} \xi_{12}] \quad (33)$$

The above results apply to any theory that induces effective interactions between a single Higgs scalar and various numbers of photons that preserve C and P symmetries as shown in eq. (1). In the following, we will show the numerical results in SM. To this end, we have to work out first the ξ parameters. Since the fermions and weak gauge bosons in SM gain mass completely through interactions with the Higgs field which develops a vacuum expectation value, v , their mass terms and interactions with the Higgs boson appear in the combined form $m(1 + h/v)$ to a linear or quadratic power. This implies a low-energy theorem [12] between a process involving a Higgs particle and one without. For a system of constant electromagnetic field strength and Higgs field, we can thus establish a relation between the effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_h$ in eq. (1) and the Heisenberg-Euler effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}}$:

$$\mathcal{L}_h = \frac{h}{v} \left(\sum_f m_f \frac{\partial}{\partial m_f} + \sum_V m_V \frac{\partial}{\partial m_V} \right) \mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}} = \frac{g_2 h}{m_W} \left(\sum_f m_f^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial m_f^2} + \sum_V m_V^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial m_V^2} \right) \mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}} \quad (34)$$

The mass-proportionality means that only the top quark and $W^\pm$ bosons are actually relevant; namely, for photonic Higgs decays, we only have to include in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}}$ the polarization effects due to vacuum top quarks and $W^\pm$ bosons:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}}^t + \mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}}^{W^\pm} + \dots \quad (35)$$

The vacuum polarization effects due to top quarks $\mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}}^t$ can be readily obtained from the QED result [17, 18], see [19] for a review, by the substitutions of the electron parameters with the top ones, $m_e \rightarrow m_t$ and $-e \rightarrow Q_t e$ with $Q_t = 2/3$, and attaching a color factor $N_c = 3$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}}^t = -\frac{N_c}{8\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} e^{-m_t^2 s} \frac{Q_t^2 e^2 F_- F_+}{\tan(Q_t e F_- s) \tanh(Q_t e F_+ s)}, \quad (36)$$

where

$$F_\pm = \sqrt{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}^2 + \mathcal{G}^2} \pm \mathcal{F}} \quad (37)$$

The vacuum polarization effects due to a charged vector field were first studied in [20] for a general electromagnetic theory of a massive charged vector field. It was found that the problem was exactly solvable only when the charged vector has a gyromagnetic ratio equal to 2 whence the charge renormalization constant was found to be larger than one in contrast to QED. In retrospect, the first feature means that a consistent theory of charged vector fields has to be a non-Abelian gauge theory while the second implies asymptotic freedom in such a theory. The issue was later reexamined in a spontaneously broken gauge theory in unitary gauge [21] and nonlinear R_ξ gauge [22], see [23] for a review on the topic and related ones. The effective Lagrangian was found to be

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{H.-E.}}^{W^\pm} = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} e^{-m_W^2 s} \frac{e^2 F_- F_+ [1 - 2 \cos(2e F_- s) - 2 \cosh(2e F_+ s)]}{\sin(e F_- s) \sinh(e F_+ s)} \quad (38)$$

Upon expansion in the electromagnetic field, the low-energy theorem in eq. (34) then yields the dominant contributions in SM to the couplings in eq. (1):

$$\xi_{10} = \frac{g_2}{m_W} \frac{e^2}{(4\pi)^2} \left[-7 + \frac{4}{3} Q_t^2 N_c \right], \quad (39)$$

$$\xi_{20} = \frac{g_2}{m_W^5} \frac{2e^4}{(4\pi)^2} \left[-\frac{29}{5} - \frac{16}{45} Q_t^4 N_c \frac{m_W^4}{m_t^4} \right], \quad (40)$$

$$\xi_{02} = \frac{g_2}{m_W^5} \frac{2e^4}{(4\pi)^2} \left[-\frac{27}{5} - \frac{28}{45} Q_t^4 N_c \frac{m_W^4}{m_t^4} \right], \quad (41)$$

$$\xi_{30} = \frac{g_2}{m_W^9} \frac{6e^6}{(4\pi)^2} \left[-\frac{548}{105} + \frac{256}{315} Q_t^6 N_c \frac{m_W^8}{m_t^8} \right], \quad (42)$$

$$\xi_{12} = \frac{g_2}{m_W^9} \frac{2e^6}{(4\pi)^2} \left[-\frac{628}{105} + \frac{416}{315} Q_t^6 N_c \frac{m_W^8}{m_t^8} \right] \quad (43)$$

Two features are noteworthy. First, it seems that the $W^\pm$ contribution to the effective couplings is always negative while the top-quark contribution is alternate in sign as the power of the

electromagnetic invariants $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{G}$ increases. This is in contrast with the impression that one might have got from the destructive interference between the fermionic and bosonic loops in the two-photon decay channel. Second, because of larger mass and smaller charge the top-quark contribution becomes more and more suppressed as the power of invariants increases. For instance, its relative contribution in the cubic terms already drops down to 10^{-4} and can be totally ignored. At $m_h = 125$ GeV, these parameters yield the following approximate photonic decay widths of the Higgs boson in SM:

$$\Gamma(2\gamma) = 5.9 \times 10^{-6} \text{ GeV} \quad (44)$$

$$\Gamma(4\gamma) = 3.1 \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV} \quad (45)$$

$$\Gamma(6\gamma) = 8.5 \times 10^{-27} \text{ GeV} \quad (46)$$

We have studied the multi-photon decays of the Higgs boson that are closely related to the two-photon decay employed as a golden detection channel in the recent experimental discovery. We have parameterized the electromagnetic interactions of the Higgs boson by an effective Lagrangian, and relate it by a low-energy theorem in standard model to the Heisenberg-Euler effective Lagrangian of electromagnetism that is induced by vacuum charged particles. For the two-photon decay width, we recover the known result for the leading contribution that accounts for about 65% of the exact one-loop result. The four- and six-photon decays are found to be very much suppressed by phase space, in addition to naive counts of the fine-structure constant.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank V.V. Skalozub for providing a copy of his papers [21, 22, 23] and L. Ren for helping find a copy of the papers [20, 21, 22, 23]. This work was supported in part by the grant NSFC-11025525 and by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities No.65030021.

References

- [1] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
- [2] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
- [3] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1264 (1967).
- [4] S. L. Glashow, Nucl. Phys. **22**, 579 (1961).
- [5] A. Salam, Conf. Proc. C **680519**, 367 (1968).
- [6] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane and S. Dawson, Front. Phys. **80**, 1 (2000); Errata: hep-ph/9302272.

- [7] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 508 (1964).
- [8] F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 321 (1964).
- [9] G. S. Guralnik, C. R. Hagen and T. W. B. Kibble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 585 (1964).
- [10] J. R. Ellis, M. K. Gaillard and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B **106**, 292 (1976).
- [11] B. L. Ioffe and V. A. Khoze, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **9**, 50 (1978) [Fiz. Elem. Chast. Atom. Yadra **9**, 118 (1978)].
- [12] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, M. B. Voloshin and V. I. Zakharov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **30**, 711 (1979) [Yad. Fiz. **30**, 1368 (1979)].
- [13] A. I. Vainshtein, V. I. Zakharov and M. A. Shifman, Sov. Phys. Usp. **23**, 429 (1980) [Usp. Fiz. Nauk **131**, 537 (1980)].
- [14] T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 178 (1980) [Addendum-ibid. D **22**, 1824 (1980)].
- [15] R. Karplus and M. Neuman, Phys. Rev. **83**, 776 (1951).
- [16] Y. Aghababaie and C. P. Burgess, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 113006 (2001) [hep-ph/0006165].
- [17] W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, Z. Phys. **98**, 714 (1936) [physics/0605038].
- [18] J. S. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **82**, 664 (1951).
- [19] G. V. Dunne, In *From fields to strings, vol. 1*, edited by M. Shifman et al., pp.445-522 [hep-th/0406216].
- [20] V.S. Vanyashin and M.V. Terent'ev, Sov. Phys. JETP **21**, 375 (1965) [J. Exptl. Theoret. Phys. (USSR) **48**, 565 (1965)].
- [21] V. V. Skalozub, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **21**, 690 (1976) [Yad. Fiz. **21**, 1337 (1975)].
- [22] V. V. Skalozub, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31**, 412 (1980) [Yad. Fiz. **31**, 798 (1980)].
- [23] V. V. Skalozub, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **16**, 445 (1985) [Fiz. Elem. Chast. Atom. Yadra **16**, 1005 (1985)].